UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/691,802	10/19/2000	Hidehiro Matsumoto	13992	5759

23389   7590   09/27/2004

SCULLY SCOTT MURPHY & PRESSER, PC
400 GARDEN CITY PLAZA
GARDEN CITY, NY 11530

EXAMINER
ORGAD, EDAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2684	10

DATE MAILED: 09/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 July 2004</u>.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-51* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) *1,3,5,7,9-12,14,16,18-24,26-29,32,34-37,40,42 and 44-51* is/are rejected.
7) ☒ Claim(s) *2,4,6,8,13,15,17,25,30,31,33,38,39,41 and 43* is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, filed 7-2-04, with respect to claims 1-51 have been fully

considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon

further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the
subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 21-28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 21, it is unclear whether the gateway server, the wireless client or the

source server comprises the language unit, font storing unit and output unit.

Regarding claims 29, it is not clear how the font determining unit determines which font

is to be used at the wireless client. There is no mention of any communications between the

gateway and the wireless client other than from the information source server to the wireless

client.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 1, 5, 12, 16, 21, 29, 37, 40, 47 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Timothy Bickmore et al ("Web Page Filtering and Re-Authoring for Mobile Users" August 18, 1998. Palo Alto Laboratory, CA., pages 534-546. THE COMPUTER JOURNAL, VOL. 42, NO. 6).

Regarding claims 1, 12, 21, 29, 37, 47 and 51, Bickmore teaches a wireless communication system (fig. 1) which supplies information data to a wireless client through a wireless data communication network, comprising: an information source server which includes the information data and a gateway server (see Digestor http proxy, figure 1) which is connected to the information source server via a network and selectively connected to the wireless client (see user, figure 1) via the wireless data communication network, the gateway server comprising: a font storing unit (pg. 534-535, ¶ 2.2) for storing a font which is used in the wireless client to output the information data; a font determining unit (pg. 535, ¶ 2.3) for determining a font to be stored in the font storing unit; and a font transferring unit for transferring the determined font to the wireless client, wherein the gateway server temporarily stores the information data sent from the information source server and sends the information data to the wireless client according to a data reception state of the wireless client concerned with the determined font (pg. 536, ¶ 3.1 & pg 538, ¶ 3.3.1).

Regarding claims 5, 16 and 40, Bickmore teaches the user control server cooperates with the gateway server (pg. 541, ¶ 3.4).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, 14 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Timothy Bickmore et al ("Web Page Filtering and Re-Authoring for Mobile Users" August 18,

1998. Palo Alto Laboratory, CA., pages 534-546. THE COMPUTER JOURNAL, VOL. 42, NO.

6) in view of Kovacs et al (US 2001/0003191).

Regarding claims 3, 14 and 22, Bickmore fails to specifically disclose the gateway server

includes an authenticating unit which performs authentication for connecting the wireless client

to the gateway server. However, an authenticating unit which performs authentication for

connecting the wireless client to the gateway server is well known in the art as disclosed by

Kovacs, see paragraph 0056. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time the invention was made to include Kovacs' teachings of authenticating unit

which performs authentication for connecting the wireless client to the gateway server with

Bickmore's invention in order to assure proper usage of the system.

Claims 9-11, 18-20, 26-29, 34-36, 44-46 and 48-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

as being unpatentable over Timothy Bickmore et al ("Web Page Filtering and Re-Authoring for

Mobile Users" August 18, 1998. Palo Alto Laboratory, CA., pages 534-546. THE COMPUTER

JOURNAL, VOL. 42, NO. 6).

Regarding claims 9-11, 18-20, 26-29, 34-36, 44-46 and 48-50, Bickmore fails to specifically disclose the determined font is a character font used to display or a special font representing a pictogram or a voice font used to output a voice. However, official notice is taken, that it is well known in the art to have a font that a character font used to display or a special font representing a pictogram or a voice font used to output a voice. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a font that is a character font used to display or a special font representing a pictogram or a voice font used to output a voice with Bickmore's invention in order to provide the user with different options regarding the particular manipulations of the fonts.

Claims 7, 23, 24, 32 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Timothy Bickmore et al ("Web Page Filtering and Re-Authoring for Mobile Users" August 18, 1998. Palo Alto Laboratory, CA., pages 534-546. THE COMPUTER JOURNAL, VOL. 42, NO. 6) in view of Simon et al (US 6,065,008).

Regarding claims 7, 23, 24, 32 and 42, Bickmore fails to specifically disclose a font server which stores a plurality of candidate fonts used and selected by the font determining unit. However, Simon does disclose a font server which stores a plurality of candidate fonts used and selected by the font determining unit (col. 2, lines 27-39). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a font server which stores a plurality of candidate fonts used and selected by the font determining unit as taught by Simon with Bickmore's invention in order to provide to user with numerous fonts.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 13, 15, 17, 25, 30, 31, 33, 38, 39, 41 and 43 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Regarding claims 2, 13, 31 and 39, the prior art of record fails to specifically disclose the font-determining unit determines the font that corresponds to a language selected in the wireless client.

Regarding claims 4, 15, 30 and 38, the prior art of record fails to specifically disclose the font determining unit determines the font while the authenticating unit performs the authentication.

Regarding claims 6, 17 and 41, the prior art of record fails to specifically disclose determining the font by using a user information database which includes at least user information stored in advance to be used in the authenticating unit, correspondence information which represents relationship between the language used by the font determining unit and the font stored to display the information data, and history of determining results of the font determining unit.

Regarding claims 8, 25, 33 and 43, the prior art of record fails to specifically disclose a plurality of candidate fonts used by the font determining unit are stored to be determined as the determined font in the gateway server.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US 2003/0203732 Dynamic Content Filter in a Gateway.

US 2003/0078631 Network communications arrangement for IMD programming units.

US 6,401,091 Business information repository system and method of operation.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edan Orgad whose telephone number is 703-305-4223. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM to 5:30PM with every other Friday off..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edan Orgad can be reached on 703-305-4223. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

EDAN ORGAD
PATENT EXAMINER/TELECOMM.

9/26/04